### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

KATRICE WOODS	:	
57 E. Hortter Street	:	
Philadelphia, PA 19119	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	No.
,		

v.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PROGRESSIVE HEALTH INC.
525 West Chester Pike, Suite 311A
Havertown, PA 19083
and
FRIDAY OBASEIME
525 West Chester Pike, Suite 311A
Havertown, PA 19083

:

Defendant.

#### **CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, by and through herundersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

#### **INTRODUCTION**

1. This action has been initiated by Katrice Woods (*hereinafter* referred to as "Plaintiff," unless indicated otherwise) against Progressive Health Inc. and Friday Obaseime (*hereinafter* referred to as "Defendants" unless referred to individually) for violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII - 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d *et. seq.*), the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA"), the Philadelphia Fair Practices Ordinance, Phila. Code 9-1100 *et seq.* ("PFPO"), the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA" - 29 U.S.C. 201, *et. seq.*) and the Pennsylvania

Minimum Wage Act.<sup>1</sup> As a direct consequence of Defendant's unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a)(4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violations of federal laws.
- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because their contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendants to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because Defendants are deemed to reside where they are subjected to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendants residents of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 5. Plaintiff filed a charge of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and also dual-filed said charge with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission ("PHRC"). Plaintiff has properly exhausted her administrative proceedings before initiating this action by timely filing and dual-filing his Charge with the EEOC and the PHRC, and by filing the instant lawsuit within 90 days of receiving a right-to-sue letter from the EEOC.

2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiff will move to amend her instant lawsuit to include claims under the PHRA and the PFPO once her administrative remedies are fully exhausted with the appropriate administrative agencies. Any claims under the PHRA/PFPO though would mirror the instant Title VII claims identically, but will also include claims against Defendant Obaseime.

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
  - 6. Plaintiff is a black, American female.
- 7. Defendant Progressive Health Inc. is an entity engaging primarily in the business of providing in-home care for elderly or infirmed individuals in several counties throughout Pennsylvania, with headquarters located at the address set forth in the above-caption.
- 8. Upon information and belief, Defendant Obaseime owns and operates Defendant Progressive Health Inc. and is a high-level manager and decision maker concerning terms and conditions of employment for employees such as Plaintiff, including but not limited to compensation/payment of wages for work performed.
- 9. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted by and through its agents, servants, and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendants.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 10. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth infull.
  - 11. Plaintiff was hired by Defendants on or about November 2, 2018.
- 12. Throughout her employment, Plaintiff was a dedicated and hardworking employee, working not only as a full-time Office Manager, but also working an additional approximate 60 hours per week as a Home Care Worker.
- 13. Plaintiff worked out of Defendants' Cottman, Philadelphia, PA, location and was supervised by Defendants' Owners, Defendant Obaseime and Karen Ejorh, who are African.

- 14. Unfortunately, throughout Plaintiff's employment, she was subjected to an extremely discriminatory environment within Defendants.
- 15. Specifically, Defendant Obaseime and Ejorh are very pro-African and very anti-American, and as a result subjected Plaintiff and others to numerous derogatory comments about Americans in general, as well as black Americans specifically.
- 16. By way of example,<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff and other black Americans were consistently 1) referred to as lazy blacks, 2) described as having no work ethic because they are from America, 3) told black Americans are not spiritual enough, and 4) called stupid in reference to being black Americans.
- 17. As a result of the discriminatory comments that she was subjected to throughout her employment, increasingly in the months leading to her separation, Plaintiff complained several times to Defendants' management, including to Defendant Obaseime, specifically objecting to any further national origin comments or discrimination, and expressly stating that she was highly offended by the same.
- 18. Shortly thereafter, on or about September 2, 2020, in close proximity to her most recent complaints of discrimination, Plaintiff was abruptly terminated by Defendants, including Obaseime, who had suddenly begun to hurl numerous false accusations at her, including that she had purportedly committed numerous billing errors and distracted other employees from completing their work.
- 19. After ultimately instructing Plaintiff to go home, requiring her to turn in her office keys, refusing to provide Plaintiff with any date to return to work, and locking Plaintiff out of

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This list is not intended to be an exhaustive list, but is provided solely for illustration purposes.

Defendants' operating system, Defendant Obaseime further approached employees explaining that he had terminated Plaintiff for reasons <u>other</u> than those suddenly addressed with her, including stealing inventory from Defendants, lying, not doing her job, and for gossiping in the office.

- 20. Each of the accusations unexpectedly made toward Plaintiff and as alleged by Obaseime for Plaintiff's termination, however, are entirely pretextual, as:
  - a. Each alleged reason is patently false and/or were properly attributed to individuals other than Plaintiff who were not similarly subjected to similar disciplinary action;
  - Plaintiff had never received any disciplinary action, been warned, or reprimanded
     by Defendants for any of the reasons alleged;
  - c. Upon information and belief, no investigation was ever performed by Defendants in allegedly terminating Plaintiff for such reasons; and
  - d. Defendants have provided numerous different alleged reasons for terminating Plaintiff, as identified above, as well as subsequently directly contradicting these alleged reasons for Plaintiff's termination by submitting to federal and state administrative agencies that Plaintiff was <u>never</u> actually terminated, but instead voluntarily resigned from her employment, which is also entirely and demonstrably false.
- 21. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers that she was terminated because of her race/national origin and/or in retaliation for making multiple complaints of race/national origin discrimination (the last of which was made in close proximity to her abrupt and pretextual termination).

22. Moreover, following Plaintiff's separation from employment, likely in further retaliation for Plaintiff's complaints of discrimination, Defendants also failed to properly pay Plaintiff overtime on her final paycheck.

23. Specifically, during her last full week of employment, Plaintiff worked approximately sixty (60) hours as a Home Care Worker.

24. Defendants cannot dispute that Plaintiff's position as a Home Care Worker was a non-exempt position under federal and state law, as it paid Plaintiff on an hourly basis and classified Plaintiff as nonexempt throughout her employment, often paying her overtime for such work.

25. Despite being well aware that Plaintiff had worked sixty (60) hours in this non-exempt position during the last week of her employment, as reflected by Plaintiff's final paystub, however, Defendants nevertheless paid her for sixty (60) hours at her *base rate* of \$13 per hour, without paying Plaintiff at a rate of time and a half for each hour she worked over 40, as required.

26. Therefore, Defendants failed to properly pay Plaintiff overtime during the final week of her employment, as required under federal and state law.

# Count I <u>Violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII")</u> (Race/National Origin Discrimination and Retaliation) -Against Defendant Progressive Health Inc. Only-

- 27. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 28. Plaintiff was subjected to disparate and discriminatory treatment based on the numerous discriminatory comments made to her and other employees in her presence, which she complained about numerous times in the months and weeks leading up to her termination.

6

- 29. In close proximity to making her last complaint of race/national origin discrimination to Defendants' management, Plaintiff was then terminated for entirely pretextual reasons, which Defendants have contradicted numerous times since.
- 30. Furthermore, following her separation from employment, Defendants intentionally withheld overtime payments from Plaintiff, as outlined above.
- 31. Plaintiff therefore believes that she was terminated and not paid overtime because of her race/national origin and/or because of her complaints of race/national origin discrimination.
- 32. These actions as aforesaid constitute unlawful discrimination and retaliation under Title VII.

## Count II <u>Violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA")</u> (Failure to Pay Overtime) - Against Both Defendants -

- 33. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 34. Defendants meet all criteria to be an employer or enterprise, collectively or individually, under the FLSA.
- 35. Plaintiff was not properly paid for all owed overtime as explained *supra*. Such actions constitute indefensible violations of the FLSA.

#### **Count III**

## Violations of the Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act ("PMWA") (Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation) - Against Both Defendants -

36. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

- 37. Defendants meet all criteria to be an employer or enterprise, collectively or individually, under the PMWA.
- 38. Plaintiff was not properly paid for all owed overtime as explained supra. Such actions constitute indefensible violations of the PMWA.

#### **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

- A. Defendants are to be prohibited from continuing to maintain their illegal policies, practices, or customs of retaliating against employees and are to be ordered to promulgate effective policies against discriminating and retaliating against employees, and committing overtime and wage violations;
- B. Defendants are to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendants' illegal actions, including but not limited to back pay, front pay, bonuses and medical and other benefits. Plaintiff should be accorded those benefits illegally withheld from the date she first suffered discrimination/retaliation at the hands of Defendants until the date of verdict;
- C. Plaintiff is to be awarded punitive damages as permitted by applicable law in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendants for their willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct, and to deter Defendants from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- D. Plaintiff is to be awarded liquidated and/or punitive damages as permitted by applicable law;
- E. Plaintiff is to be accorded any and all other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper, and appropriate (including but not limited to emotional distress/pain and suffering damages where permitted under applicable law(s)).

8

F. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable legal

fees as provided by applicable federal and state law;

G. Any verdict in favor of Plaintiff is to be molded by the Court to maximize the

financial recovery available to Plaintiff in light of the caps on certain damages set forth in

applicable federal law; ands

H. Plaintiff's claims are to receive a trial by jury to the extent allowed by applicable

law. Plaintiff has also endorsed this demand on the caption of this Complaint in accordance with

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b).

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Ari R. Karpf, Esquire 3331 Street Road Two Greenwood Square Suite 128

Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

Dated: March 24, 2021

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Katrice Woods	•	;	CIVIL ACTION	•
v.		:		
Progressive Health	Inc., et al.	<b>;</b>	NO.	
plaintiff shall complete a C filing the complaint and ser side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	Case Manageme The a copy on all Event that a de t shall, with its it arties, a Case M	nt Track Des defendants. efendant doe first appearar Janagement	ay Reduction Plan of this court, courignation Form in all civil cases at the (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the s not agree with the plaintiff regardince, submit to the clerk of court and s I rack Designation Form specifying thigned.	time of reverse ng said erve on
SELECT ONE OF THE I	FOLLOWING	CASE MAN	AGEMENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.				
(b) Social Security - Cases and Human Services de	s requesting revenying plaintiff	iew of a deci Social Secur	sion of the Secretary of Health ity Benefits.	· ( )
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.				
(d) Asbestos – Cases involexposure to asbestos.	ving claims for	personal inju	ury or property damage from	( )
commonly referred to a	is complex and	that need spe	acks (a) through (d) that are ecial or intense management by led explanation of special	( )
(f) Standard Management	- Cases that do	not fall into	any one of the other tracks.	(X)
3/25/2021			Plaintiff	
Date	Attorne	y-at-law	Attorney for	***************************************
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639		akarpf@karpf-law.com	
Telephone	FAX N	umber	E-Mail Address	
	,			

(Civ. 660) 10/02

### Case 2:21-cv-01423-GAMED ROCK PRICTIC OF PENNSYLVANIA Page 11 of 12 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### **DESIGNATION FORM**

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendants place of business    Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendants place of business	Address of Plaintiff: 57 E. Hortter Street, Philadelphia, PA 19119					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendants place of business    RELATED CASE, IF ANY:						
Case Number:						
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:  1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?  4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No X case filed by the same individual?  1. Indemnity contract, to my knowledge, the within case in it is court except as noted above.  1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts Almanus Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts Contract and Other Contracts Contract C	RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?  4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights are individual?  1. Indempty and the same individual?  2. It is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.  2. PATE: 3/25/2021	Case Number:					
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit	Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
a. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?  4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No X case filed by the same individual?  I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is / S is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.  DATE: 3/25/2021						
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION  Yes No X  No X  ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION  Yes No X  No X  Arboney-action of this court?  Yes No X  No X  ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION  Yes No X  Yes No X  Arboney-action of this court?  Yes No X  N						
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)  A. Federal Question Cases:  □ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts □ 2. FELA □ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury □ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury □ 4. Antitrust □ 5. Patent □ 6. Labor-Management Relations □ 7. Civil Rights □ 7. Civil Rights □ 9. Securities Act(s) Cases □ 10. Social Security Review Cases □ 11. All other Federal Question Cases □ 12. Federal Question Cases □ 13. Jones Act-Personal Injury □ 14. Antitrust □ 5. Patent □ 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury □ 6. Labor-Management Relations □ 7. Civil Rights □ 9. Securities Act(s) Cases □ 10. Social Security Review Cases □ 11. All other Federal Question Cases  (Please specify): □ ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION						
this court except as noted above.  DATE: 3/25/2021  Attorney at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff  Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)  CIVIL: (Place a \sqrt{in one category only})  A. Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  2. FELA  3. Jones Act-Personal Injury  3. Assault, Defamation  4. Antitrust  4. Marine Personal Injury  5. Patent  6. Labor-Management Relations  7. Civil Rights  9. Securities Act(s) Cases  9. Securities Act(s) Cases  10. Social Security Review Cases  11. All other Federal Question Cases  (Please specify):  ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION						
Atterney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff  Attorney LD. # (if applicable)  CIVIL: (Place a \sqrt in one category only)  A. Federal Question Cases:  1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  2. FELA  3. Jones Act-Personal Injury  4. Antitrust  5. Patent  6. Labor-Management Relations  7. Civil Rights  8. Habeas Corpus  9. Securities Act(s) Cases  10. Social Security Review Cases  11. All other Federal Question Cases  (Please specify):  ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION						
CIVIL: (Place a √in one category only)  A. Federal Question Cases:  1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  2. FELA  3. Jones Act-Personal Injury  4. Antitrust  5. Patent  6. Labor-Management Relations  7. Civil Rights  8. Habeas Corpus  9. Securities Act(s) Cases  10. Social Security Review Cases  11. All other Federal Question Cases  (Please specify):  ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION	DATE.					
A. Federal Question Cases:    Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)					
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts       □ 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts         2. FELA       □ 2. Airplane Personal Injury         3. Jones Act-Personal Injury       □ 3. Assault, Defamation         4. Antitrust       □ 4. Marine Personal Injury         5. Patent       □ 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury         6. Labor-Management Relations       □ 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): □ 7. Products Liability         8. Habeas Corpus       □ 8. Products Liability - Asbestos         9. Securities Act(s) Cases       □ 9. All other Diversity Cases         10. Social Security Review Cases       □ 9. All other Diversity Cases         (Please specify):       □ 7. Products Liability - Asbestos         11. All other Federal Question Cases       □ 9. All other Diversity Cases         (Please specify):       □ 9. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION	CIVIL: (Place a √in one category only)					
□ 2. FELA □ 2. Airplane Personal Injury   □ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury □ 3. Assault, Defamation   □ 4. Antitrust □ 4. Marine Personal Injury   □ 5. Patent □ 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury   □ 6. Labor-Management Relations □ 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify):	A. Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:					
6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify):	□       2. FELA       □       2. Airplane Personal Injury         □       3. Jones Act-Personal Injury       □       3. Assault, Defamation					
7. Civil Rights						
9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):	7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability					
11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):  ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION	9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases					
	11. All other Federal Question Cases					
(The system of the constraint and the constraint an						
I, Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:						
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:						
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.						
DATE: 3/25/2021 ARK2484 / 91538	DATE: 3/25/2021 ARK2484 / 91538					
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)					

#### Case 2:21-cv-01423-GA M Document 1 Filed 03/25/21 Page 12 of 12 VIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as

provided by local rules of court purpose of initiating the civil do	. This form, approved by the ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	e Judicial Conference of the Indiana	he United States in September 19' THIS FORM.)	74, is required for the use of th	e Clerk of Court for the	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
WOODS, KATRICE			PROGRESSIVE	HEALTH INC., ET AL		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, 1 Suite 128, Bensalem, PA	P.C.; 3331 Street Road	d, Two Greenwood S	<b>4</b> 1			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI  1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	CTION (Place an "X" in On  X 3 Federal Question  (U.S. Government )		II. CITIZENSHIP OF PI (For Diversity Cases Only) PI Citizen of This State		and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	of Business In T  Incorporated and Priof Business In A	incipal Place 5 5	
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ly) PRTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here for: Nature of BANKRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions.  OTHER STATUTES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  315 Airplane Product Liability  320 Assault, Libel & Slander  330 Federal Employers' Liability  340 Marine  345 Marine Product Liability  350 Motor Vehicle  755 Motor Vehicle Product Liability  360 Other Personal Injury  362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice  CIVIL RIGHTS  440 Other Civil Rights  441 Voting  X 442 Employment  443 Housing/ Accommodations  445 Amer. w/Disabilities Other  3 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other  3 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury - Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  385 Property Damage  Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIONS  Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  530 General  535 Death Penalty Other:  540 Mandamus & Other  550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition  560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act	422 Appeal 28 USC 158   423 Withdrawal   28 USC 157   PROPERTY RIGHTS   820 Copyrights   830 Patent   835 Patent - Abbreviated   New Drug Application   840 Trademark   SOCIAL SECURITY   861 HIA (1395ff)   862 Black Lung (923)   863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))   864 SSID Title XVI   865 RSI (405(g))   FEDERAL TAX SUITS   870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff   or Defendant)   871 IRS—Third Party   26 USC 7609	□ 375 False Claims Act ' 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
	moved from atte Court	Appellate Court	(specify	er District Litigation Transfer		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Title VII (42USC) Brief description of ca	(2000); FLSA (29US) use:	filing (Do not cite jurisdictional status C201)  The property of the PA Minim (C201)			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$		if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 3/25/2021		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	DRNEY OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						

**Print** 

RECEIPT#

AMOUNT

Save As..

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

Reset

MAG. JUDGE